

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/458,366 12/09/99 EVANS

R SALK2270-2

HM12/0419

Stephen E. Reiter  
Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich LLP  
4365 EXECUTIVE DRIVE  
SUITE 1600  
SAN DIEGO CA 92121-2189

EXAMINER

WOITACH, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1632

DATE MAILED:

04/19/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/458,366

Applicant(s)

Evans, R. M.

Examiner

Joseph T. Voitach

Group Art Unit

1632



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph T. Voitach(3) Stanley Kim(2) Steve E. Reiter

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Apr 18, 2001Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: pending claims

Identification of prior art discussed:

General discussion of SXR function as related to other superfamily members.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant contacted Examiner to discuss the basis of the 112 1st rejections. The specific issues discussed were: breadth to a liver specific promoter, functional language that describes the hSXR encoded by the transgene, and the resulting phenotype--tissue specific expression, DNA binding domain, binding of specific compounds to hSXR (versus mSXR), specific genes transcribed in response to expression and presence of a compound which binds the hSXR. Each were discussed with respect to language which adequately described the specific embodiment allowing for adequate breadth within the context of function of hSXR when expressed in the liver. Applicants were pointed to the scope rejection on page 8 of the final office action as enabled subject matter for the two transgenic mice which were created.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.